

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 24, 2003.

John J. Kelly, Jr.

John J. Kelly, Jr. Reg. No.: 29,182

Examiner : Sikyin Ip
Art Unit : 1742
Docket No.: 52437/24

10/12/03
11/08/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Y. YOSHITOMI et al.

Serial No. : 09/783,408

Filed : February 14, 2001

For : THICK GRAIN-ORIENTED ELECTRICAL STEEL SHEET
EXHIBITING EXCELLENT MAGNETIC PROPERTIES

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

SIR:

This is a Request For Continued Examination
(RCE) under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 of the above-identified patent
application. A petition for an extension of time accompanies

this RCE.

This Request For Continued Examination is

responsive to the Office Action mailed March 26, 2003 and the
Advisory Action mailed August 12, 2003.

It is requested that the unentered amended claims of the Amendment Under Rule 116 filed July 28, 2003 be entered and that the arguments for patentable in the Amendment Under Rule 116 be considered.

Amended independent claim 4 and claims 5-6 are pending in the application.

The Advisory Action stated at page in Continuation of 5 that "Applicant argue that the examples of the cited references have thinner sheet thickness. But, the examples in the cited references are for illustration not for limitation".

It is agreed that the examples are for illustration. However, the illustrations of the examples of a reference are the teachings or suggestions of the references to one skill in the art.

It is further requested that the arguments for patentability in the Amendment Under Rule 116 be considered as a whole.

It was stated at page 9 lines 6-10 of the Amendment Under Rule 116 that U.S. Patent No. 4,318,758 describes a sheet thickness of 0.3 mm in the examples and U.S. Patent No. 4,054,471 does not disclose a sheet thickness in the examples. However, it was also argued at page 9, lines 11-13 that neither U.S. Patent No. 4,054,471 nor U.S. Patent No. 4,318,758 discloses slab heating temperature or nitriding. See, also, e.g., page 11, lines 11-16 of the Amendment Under

Rule 116 where it is argued that neither U.S. Patent No. 4,054,471 nor U.S. Patent No. 4,318,758 use a nitriding treatment. The present invention requires nitriding and setting total N-content to 0.010-0.027% by weight after nitriding treatment of the sheet in NH_3 gas following decarburization annealing. The process of U.S. Patent No. 4,318,758 and U.S. Patent No. 4,054,471 are very different than the process of the present invention.

At page 9, lines 16-18 of the Amendment Under Rule 116, it was pointed out that the Examples of U.S. Patent No. 5,190,597 and U.S. Patent No. 4,979,996 describe a sheet thickness of 0.23 mm. However, it was also pointed out that the maximum sheet thickness disclosed in these patents was 0.30 mm. The present invention is directed to a 0.36 - 1.00 mm sheet thickness. It was also argued at page 10, lines 3-7 of the Amendment Under Rule 116 that U.S. Patent No. 5,190,597 and U.S. Patent No. 4,979,996 are directed to thin materials and show no awareness with respect to controlling the SF values and the $\Delta\theta$ (crystal orientation deviation) values as required by the present invention.

Consideration of the patentability of amended independent claim 4 of the Amendment Under Rule 116, and all claims dependent thereon, is respectfully requested. Consideration of all arguments for patentability presented in the Amendment Under Rule 116 is respectfully requested.

An action on the merits is respectfully
requested.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON

By: John J. Kelly, Jr.
John J. Kelly, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,182

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646